

COMMENTS

The enclosed is responsive to the Examiner's Office Action mailed on April 9, 2008. At the time the Examiner mailed the Office Action claims 1-11, 13-28 and 30-34 were pending. By way of the present response the Applicant has: 1) amended claims 1, 11, 18 and 28; 2) not canceled any claims; and, 3) not added any claims. As such claims 1-11, 13-28 and 30-34 remain pending. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application and the allowance of claims 1-11, 13-28 and 30-34.

All claims remain rejected as being anticipated by the Avakian reference (U.S. Pub. App. No. 2005/0039171).


On May 1, 2008 the Examiner and Applicant entertained a telephonic interview as described by the Examiner's Interview Summary mailed May 6, 2006. The Applicant has herewith amended the claims consistently with the Examiner's suggestion and the Applicant's proposals.

Firstly, the Applicant has replaced the term "component" with the term "dispatcher".

Secondly, the Applicant has amended the independent claims to recite a plug-in identifier returned by the dispatcher is "not . . . a Boolean value that represents one of only two possible states". As the Applicant understands Avakian, referring to Fig. 7 of Avakian, invocation of the ExecCallback interface by an

instrumented method (in response to entry of that instrumented method) returns a Boolean value (i.e., a "true" or "false" as represented by null value 730 in Fig. 7 of Avakian). By contrast, paragraph [0071] of the Applicant's specification explains that the dispatcher returns a reference to the appropriate plug-in which is used to call upon the plug-in (e.g., a numeric identifier that uniquely identifies the specific plug-in). Such an identifier is not a boolean value. Therefore the Applicant respectfully submits that the Applicant's amendment successfully overcomes this perspective of Avakian.

The Applicant has also amended the claims to recite that the plug-in identifier is used to directly invoke the plug-in. Close examination of the Applicant's claims reveals that the dispatcher receives invocations in response to registration and method entry events while the plug-in receives an invocation in order for instrumentation data to be reported. By contrast, Avakian's ExecCallback interface receives invocations from all three events. These distinctions were visually depicted in the Applicant's last Office Action response mailed on December 10, 2007 and are redrawn again immediately below (along with a representation of the Boykin reference).



The Applicant has also amended the claims to clearly recite that instrumented methods invoke the dispatcher as well as remove limitations that are not germane to the procedural posture of the present application.

The Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 18 are patentable as presented and respectfully requests the allowance of all claims now presented.

In the further interests of efficiency, the Applicant reserves the right under MPEP 2144.03.C to cause the Examiner to find in the prior art subject matter to which the Examiner has taken Official Notice at a later time in the prosecution of the present case when the subject matter of such prior art is actually at issue.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome by the amendments and remarks, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejections be withdrawn and the pending claims be allowed.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: _____

7/9/08



Robert B. O'Rourke
Reg. No. 46,972

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, California 94085
(408) 720-8300